

JUL 30 2007

PATENT

Application No.: 10/693,318

Attorney Docket: 0001.13

REMARKS

Claims 2-25 are presently pending in the case. Claims 2 and 11 have been amended. Claims 20-25 have been added. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification as originally filed. For example, see Figures 7 and 8.

Reconsideration of the present case in view of the above amendments and the remarks herein is requested.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 6-11, 13 and 15-19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 3,809,084 to Hansen (hereinafter Hansen) in view of U.S. Patent 4,022,224 to Saifer et al (hereinafter Saifer et al). The rejection is traversed.

Hansen and Saifer et al do not render independent claim 2 and 11 unpatentable. Hansen and Saifer do not render claims 2 and 11 unpatentable for the reasons set forth in Applicant's response of March 20, 2006. In addition, claims 2 and 11 recite that the gas flows in a vortical flow path in the chamber. Neither reference discloses such a flow path. The "swirl" of Hansen is not a vertical flow path, but is instead merely a turbulent flow. To clearly bring out this distinction, claims 2 and 11 have been amended to recite first and second inlets. These inlets operate together to create a vertical flow path as shown, for example, in Figure 5 where two tangential inlets are used or in Figure 8 where a tangential and an axial inlet are used. Accordingly, claims 2 and 11 are allowable over Hansen and Saifer et al. Claims 4, 6-10, 13, and 15-19 depend from either claim 2 or 11 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as the claim from which they depend.

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Saifer et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,174,712 to Moren et al (hereinafter Moren). The rejection is traversed. Moren does not make up for the deficiencies of Hansen and Saifer et al.

PATENT

Application No.: 10/693,318

Attorney Docket: 0001.13

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Saifer et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,534,343 to Nowacki et al (hereinafter Nowacki et al). The rejection is traversed. Nowacki et al does not make up for the deficiencies of Hansen and Saifer et al.

PATENT


Application No.: 10/693,318

Attorney Docket: 0001.13

Conclusion

The claims are allowable for the reasons given above. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the present rejections and allow the presently pending claims. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

NEKTAR THERAPUETICS
(formerly INHALE THERAPEUTIC
SYSTEMS, INC.Dated: 30 JUL 2007By: 
Guy V. Tucker
Reg. No. 45,302

Please send all correspondence to:
Guy Tucker
Nektar Therapeutics
150 Industrial Road
San Carlos, CA 94070
Phone: (650) 620-5501
Fax: (650) 631-3125